Village of Barrington
Plan Commission
Minutes

Date:	February 25, 2003
Time:	7 p.m.
Location:	Village Board Room 200 South Hough Street Barrington, Illinois
In Attendance:	Anna Bush, Chair Curt Larsen, Vice Chair Bhagwant Sidhu Harry Burroughs Steve Mack Steve Morrissey
Staff Members:	Jim Wallace, Director of Building & Planning Keith Sibral, Senior Planner Jeff O'Brien, Planner/Zoning Coordinator Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

Call to Order
Ms. Bush called the meeting to order at 7 p.m. The Roll Call noted the following: Anna Bush, Chair, present; Curt Larsen, Vice Chair, present; Bhagwant Sidhu, present; Harry Burroughs, present; Steve Mack, present; John Rometty, absent; Steve Morrissey, present.

There being a quorum, the meeting proceeded.

Plan Commission 02-05 continued Wamberg Family Limited Partnership, 700 West Main Street

Ms. Bush noted that this petition had been before the Plan Commission two times, but since this would be the first time the meeting of the Plan Commission would be broadcast, the petitioner was asked to give a summary of the project. Ms. Bush then outlined the order of the meeting:

- Petitioner presentation
- Plan Commissioners' questions of petitioner
- Staff Report
- Plan Commissioner's questions.
- Petitioner response
- Staff response
- Public comment
- Then Commission deliberation.
- Meeting would end at 9 p.m.
- If meeting were not complete, it would be continued.

Ms. Bush swore in anyone who would be giving testimony.

Mr. Thomas Hayward, of Bell Boyd and Lloyd, the lawyer for Wamberg family introduced DeeDee Wamberg, co-owner of the property; Mr. Steven Albert, Civil Design Group; David Miller of Metro Transportation; and Robert Best, a second attorney for the Wamberg family from Bell, Boyd, and Lloyd.

Mr. Hayward gave an overview of the proceedings thus far: an initial hearing on December 17, 2002; a second hearing on January 28, which included revisions; another hearing on February 4, which included additional traffic information. Mr. Hayward stated that the project had been downsized; additional site plans landscaping, and Flint Creek Bridge crossing had been designed. Additional traffic studies had also been conducted. In response to the Chair's request to provide general public with background of ownership and development of the property, Mr. Hayward pointed out on the display board the 70-acre parcel, which was bounded by Lake-Cook Road on the south; New Hart Road on the east, and Old Hart Road on the west, and office buildings on the north. UARCO originally developed the property for their plant and executive offices. It had a maximum 450-person workforce until early 1990's, when property was sold and purchased by Wambergs. UARCO in conjunction with many area government entities, helped construct New Hart Road.

In 1957, an area of about 19 acres located in southern portion was annexed to Village of Barrington and the UARCO building was built. In 1959, the rest was annexed to Barrington Hills and zoned R-1, residential. After the Wambergs purchased property in 1998, they demolished the former UARCO building and began restoration of the Flint Creek watershed.

The Wambergs retained Mr. Hayward and Mr. Steve Albert to analyze the property. The original goal was to bring the Wamberg Company headquarters now located on the Wynstone property to this site. The designers looked at the entire 70-acre site, which included wetlands and two branches of Flint Creek, as they developed a plan for the two communities. The plan called for the transfer of two 5.79-acre properties simultaneously to arrive at a logical reconfiguration of the site for this development. Mr. Hayward detailed the replacement of a single large building with several smaller office building, which would generate the same traffic as UARCO previously had. It included wetlands (30 acres of watershed) and Flint Creek. A fifth lot was left to be developed at a later date. Barrington would have control of water and sewer.

Mr. Stephen Albert, President of Civil Design Group of Naperville, then gave a description of the site plan and storm water management that had been developed for the property. Mr. Albert pointed out the existing village boundary between Barrington and Barrington Hills. Mr. Albert also pointed out an area indicated an equal area of 5.79 acres, which would be exchanged between Barrington and Barrington Hills. Mr. Albert discussed the character of each of the parcels. Mr. Albert stated that the zoning in Barrington was B-3 Office District. The petitioners were proposing 4 lots; the first would be Clark Bardes, Building 1. The first 3 lots would share an access point on Hart Road and would have turn lanes with protected turn lanes and traffic with a signal at access road. Both access points would have protected turns.

Mr. Albert said that the Barrington Hills portion would have 5 five-acre lots with access to Old Hart Road. A 14-acre parcel would be an outlot with a conservation easement. The remaining lot in Barrington Hills would be designated as commercial after the remaining 4 lots were developed. The parcels in Barrington would consist of the Clark Bardes building at 40,000 square feet on Lot 1; 48,000 square feet for Lot 2; and 46,000 square feet for Lot 3. These buildings would each be 3-story structures with parking. The southeast corner would have 3 one-story buildings. This was a change from the original proposal. With all parcels, no relief was asked for setbacks with one exception; along old Hart Road there would be 50-feet of land that would be placed as part of the conservation easement and would act as a permanent screen. This lot would have a parking setback less than that required of village.

Mr. Albert noted that the conservation development was a concern that they addressed since part of the property was floodplain and wetlands. The petitioners would expect these areas to be preserved in all developments. The site plan was designed around these elements. All developments established would use storm water best management practices. Water that was shed from buildings and parking would be filtrated and would use open vegetated swales and other filtration devices to maintain water flow into the land. Water would then be discharged into central retention wetland. Mr. Albert described it as a sacrificial wetland in that it would take the water flows and treat them before it was released into wetland and/or open space area. The water would be treated before being released, and over time the area should increase and enhance the wetlands. The petitioner did not think traditional storm sewers would be good for this wetland property.

Mr. Albert then discussed the alternate plan, which they developed as requested, in which kept the existing village boundaries as they were without the transfer of land. The primary difference was that traditional development would not protect the open space elements as the primary feature. The shorter distance would not allow the water treatment train. This was primary reason for this as well as marketing the property on Lake-Cook Road. They wanted to move the buildings away from preserve.

Mr. Albert then talked about landscape features and other best management practices. Mr. Albert pointed out that the lighter green areas were conservation easements within the lots. The dark area was a lot of itself. The lighter green area was 32.5 acres and would be managed under a single-site steward to develop a plan for restoration and maintenance. The petitioner maintained existing trees on Hart Road and Lake-Cook Road. The petitioner had maintained the silver maples and the hedge line that would be enhanced with additional planting and hedges. It would be an added buffer.

In addition to the preliminary plan for all 4 lots, Mr. Albert discussed the land banking of parking spaces. Right now, the petitioner needed 80 spaces. The petitioner land banked about 60 of the original planned spaces, and these would not be constructed until they were needed.

Mr. Larsen asked about the preliminary water detention water flow area in front of parking by Building 1; did that same situation apply to Lot 2, but not for Lot 3 or Lot 4.

Mr. Albert said it applied to all 4 lots. All of the islands would serve as bio-swales in all areas. They would all use be part of treatment train. The initial swale and open drainage system, all would be constructed as part of Phase 1.

Mr. Larsen said these were not indicated in the alternate plan and asked whether same conditions could apply.

Mr. Albert said they would try to incorporate them; however, they were in closer proximity to wetlands. The longer swale runs would be more desirable.

Mr. Larsen said the same conditions could be included.

Mr. Albert said he didn't think he had flexibility and did not have the space needed in the alternate plan. Mr. Albert had more room to achieve in this goal in the proposed plans.

Mr. Larsen said that Lot 4 was the same in both plans and both could apply.

Mr. Albert said that it was possible.

Mr. Larsen asked about the land bank proposition.

Mr. Albert stated that it could be the same in both.

Ms. Bush stated that if it appeared that the Plan Commission was not asking a lot of questions, it this was because this was their third time at seeing the presentation, and they had already asked their questions at the previous meetings.

Mr. Hayward gave a presentation of the proposed Clark Bardes building architectural plan. The proposed structure would be prairie style of red brick and a pitched metal roof with a parapet wall on top to screen the mechanical equipment. Mr. Hayward further stated that on Lots 1-4 no mechanical equipment would be able to be seen; and would be behind a parapet wall. Mr. Hayward stated the petitioner had also met with the Architectural Review Commission on three occasions. On February 13, the ARC approved the lighting, signage, building's architectural style, and landscaping plan for Clark Bardes building on Lot 1. The entrance was off Lake-Cook Road. Mr. Hayward indicated that there was some parking under the

building. The north side was a 3-story elevation and the south side was a 2-story elevation in front because of topographic fall.

Ms. Bush asked about buildings 2, 3, and 4.

Mr. Hayward explained there were no proposed facades because there was no request to build the rest of the buildings. Mr. Hayward said they would come back with the design for those when there would be a proposal.

Mr. Larsen asked whether the same architectural rendering and the same architectural flow would be used in the alternate plan as well and would the first building be on the western portion of the property for the alternate plan.

Mr. Albert replied that it had always been intention for Clark Bardes Building to be located on the west side.

Mr. Larsen then asked about the grade elevation and whether citizens would only see a two-story elevation.

Mr. Albert said there was a retaining wall on Lot 2 and said that the roofline on all would be similar in terms of elevation. Mr. Hayward clarified that the development would have to be a 3-story building on the alternate plan.

Mr. Larsen asked for clarification on the center building and said there should also be a grade fall off in the alternate plan. The parking lot of the UARCO building was still there.

Mr. Albert said the UARCO building was one-story that sat in the southwest corner of property. They would lose 8-10 feet in that location. It would be similar but his charge was to have a certain level of density and not to have a traditional park.

Mr. Larsen said that something similar could be designed under the alternate site plan.

Mr. Albert said he didn't know for sure. Mr. Albert said they would not have the location, in order to have a successful development and the petitioner did not have the variety of layouts with the alternate plan. The petitioner would have to share some areas, like parking. It was just not as good as the proposed plan.

Mr. Morrissey asked the obvious advantages of Lake-Cook Road frontage and for that to be explained.

Mr. Albert discussed the idea of selling a building in one area as compared to the other locations, the main point would be the presence; and it was a marketing feature. Mr. Hayward said they began project with a clean sheet of paper and asked the engineers to identify the topography and then asked the architects to define a campus, how to best locate the buildings and take advantage of the vistas. Mr. Hayward said it could it be done a different way. Mr. Hayward described the process they used by going through the steps to analyze the property as well as the Flint Creek and the floodplain before they even began proposal for building layout.

Mr. Burroughs asked about the land banking of the parking, and that since Wambergs did not need all the parking, and there were three aisles with no parking, would it possible to eliminate the driveway and have less pave area.

Mr. Albert stated it might be possible, but it was being left in the project for any possible future use that may demand additional parking. The petitioner can delete parking without having to delete entire plan and start over with design; and if they take road out, they would need to change geometry, turning radius, for trucks etc.

Mr. Morrissey then asked whether the center parking area could be eliminated.

Mr. Albert said that they could make a change or increase it or a use different land banking option.

Mr. Morrissey stated that the Clark Bardes building probably did not need the exposure that the other buildings might require.

Mr. Albert said they were optimizing distance to front door.

Ms. Sidhu asked about the south branch of the creek where the bridge was located and wanted to know where would the water go.

Mr. Albert gave a background explanation that one of the watersheds was 4-square miles, which drains Barrington Hills though a culvert; the petitioner would be installing a second culvert. The other branch had a 5-square mile watershed, which made a total 9-square mile watershed. The petitioner planned to improve the water within their property.

Mr. Burroughs asked about the turn lanes into the site going over the culvert and whether that would be widened.

Mr. Albert said that the improvement began at western side of culvert starts to widen and new right turn lanes were between existing culvert new turn lanes and culvert would be included.

Mr. Mack asked about the alternate plan vs. the original plan; and whether the alternate plan did not allow the runoff to be treated before it reaches conservation area or very little treatment.

Mr. Albert said that was correct. Mr. Albert had addressed the density issue on the existing parcel with an alternate plan and was not necessarily applying the same concepts.

Ms. Bush asked whether the alternate plan was more hastily drawn and not as well considered.

Mr. Albert said it was just to give an idea of size and the type of development that could be done.

Ms. Bush said if this were approved it would be massaged and turned into a better plan.

Mr. Hayward said that they had existing zoning in place and they were responding to a question as to what kind of plan could be put on the property; would land banking be used; and what type of configuration would be used. Mr. Hayward said that Mr. Albert was trying to show where the buildings would go, and they were trying to address what it would look like without the exchange of parcels.

Mr. Mack asked about the land banking, as it was addressed only in Lot 1, was land banking also possible with the rest, or did it depend on what goes in there.

Mr. Hayward said that it would depend on what company went in and if it was a single user with a low number of employees; however, they were required to meet certain minimums under the ordinances, and they had demonstrated that these could be accommodated. With any initial users, they would be asking for land banking on them as well if it was appropriate. The question was raised that if Clark Bardes did not move into this building, would they be able to accommodate another user if they needed more parking. The design would be able to provide it.

Ms. Bush asked a technical question on Lot 2, about the retaining wall, south was there also a retaining wall there in the middle.

Mr. Albert said that it was not a retaining wall; it was a curb line and would hold water back.

Ms. Bush asked for the necessity for retaining wall in middle.

Mr. Albert stated that the original UARCO building served as a retaining wall; this design replaced that function.

Mr. Hayward asked Mr. Miller to make a presentation.

Dave Miller president Metro Transportation, Hanover Park, IL.

Mr. Miller went over the preliminary studies. Initially Metro did traffic counts at 7-9 a.m. and 4-6 p.m. at 5 different locations: Intersections of Hart/New Hart and US14; Hart and High School Drive; Hart right in and out driveway south of the main driveway by high school and driveway and Hart/Main and Main /Old Hart. These were supplemented by Civil Tech traffic studies at Main/Dundee and Main/59 that were conducted in 1990. Metro also conducted daily traffic counts on Hart Road and on Main. Metro also did gap studies at the proposed access drive to Lake-Cook Road to identify how convenient it would be for exiting traffic. Metro reviewed site distance on Hart Road and Lake-Cook Road. Mr. Miller also personally had observed traffic on 4 different occasions over last couple months close to this site.

Mr. Miller stated that the survey results showed that the street peak hours occur from 7-8 morning and 4-5:30 in the afternoon. The afternoon was typical, but morning is atypical because of the high school early arrival times. The traffic peaks between 7 and 7:30. This fact was confirmed by Civil Tech counts.

Metro then looked at traffic generated from the site. Metro originally looked at all 5 parcels; now they were concentrating only on Lots 1-4. The original plan called for 188,000 square feet of office space, and now it was at 170,000 square feet about 10% reduction. Some of that reduction came from the underground parking which was included in square footage of building, but from traffic standpoint should not be included.

Metro used Institute of Traffic Engineers estimates of traffic that would be generated. Metro estimated the amount of traffic during the peak hours. Metro observed that the existing staff would be about half of that generated by a regular office building. Metro were conservative in their estimates. The trip generation information from their surveys indicated most of site's traffic arrives after 8 in the morning. The amount of traffic generating would be 20-25% of the numbers. Metro had assumed the worst-case scenario, and in reality most of this traffic would be later than indicated. Again at the high school, much of high school traffic gets there before 8 a.m.

Once Metro had estimate of traffic, they then assigned the traffic to different areas. Metro did this for Lots 1-4 during the peak hours and estimated how would this increase total volume at the surrounding intersections. Metro estimated a 5.2% increase in the morning and 4.7% increase in the afternoon would be the total approach volume as compared to the existing traffic.

The major intersection at Main and 59 traffic volumes for all 4 buildings were an increase over 3% in the morning and 2.9% increase in the evening. Two other intersections closer to site with less volume and T-intersections would be affected. The Main/Hart intersection would experience an 8.6 % increase in morning and an 8.8% increase in evening. The Main/Dundee intersection would experience a 6.9% increase in the morning and a 7.8% increase in the evening.

Mrs. Sidhu asked if those numbers were with all buildings constructed.

Mr. Miller said that it would be Lots 1-4 and would be less with just one building constructed.

Ms. Bush asked if that was the percentage increase over current amount traffic or was percentage based on trip movement from the site.

Mr. Miller said that it was peak hours only and the percent of traffic generated from all directions with all Lots 1-4 total site traffic.

Ms. Bush asked if the p.m. peak was 353, then it would be 8.6% of 353. Ms. Bush asked if that was total peak movements in and out.

Mr. Miller said that the vehicles were distributed throughout the intersections, not going through only one intersection.

Ms. Bush said that she was trying to calculate the number of movements.

Mr. Miller said in his addendum report showed specific movements through the intersections. The Main/Hart intersection, with Lots 1-4 developed, there would be 40 southbound on Hart and 10 eastbound on Lake-Cook and 117 which were westbound in the morning, those 3 movements over the existing volume at Main and Hart were used. Metro addressed how much of a percentage increase would be added to each intersection.

Mr. Miller then focused in on Main/Dundee.

Mr. Larsen asked if there was a chart on this information.

Ms. Bush said that the addendum did not have the information.

Mr. Miller said these two graphs were just prepared in response to a staff request regarding Main/Dundee and were not included in the material.

Mr. Miller further explained the a.m. peak hours 7-8 a.m. the first number on the graphs was the existing volume of traffic southbound on Hart approaching Main (520 vehicles); the site traffic would be 40 vehicles (indicated in parentheses) in relation to existing traffic. This showed the reverse flow going to site. The number on Main Street between Hart and Dundee eastbound was 1,095, and the proposed development would be adding 17 vehicles or about 2%. Heavy flow to the east was not impacted. Heading westbound was not the peak flow; the proposed development's site traffic would be westbound (not the peak flow) was a much higher number but compounding the peak flow, which was eastbound and not impacting the traffic flow.

Ms. Bush asked him to repeat the numbers going westbound.

Mr. Miller stated that westbound on Main in a.m. approaching Hart there were 525 vehicles; the site traffic would add 117. As one gets east of Dundee traffic volume is 860 vehicles, the proposed development would add 11. Heading west past Dundee the flow is 543, the proposed development would add 73. On Dundee the heaviest flow (northbound) is 483, the proposed development would add 44. Traffic volumes on southbound Dundee are 150 vehicles, the proposed development would add 6.

Mr. Larsen said then the development would be adding 15%-20% to traffic load to total volume.

Mr. Miller said there were different ways of figuring it, but Metro looked at percentage of total movements. Metro looked how they were impacting cut through traffic. The proposed development would be adding 50 vehicles two ways, less than one per minute.

Since the staff raised questions, Metro Transportation looked at the previous Civil Tech data for the intersection of Lake-Cook Road and Dundee Avenue. In the morning, this intersection was operating at a level of service F, or failing. Metro checked on existing signal timings; the intersection was now operating service level D in the morning and level E in the evening.

Ms. Bush asked about the meanings of the level of service.

Mr. Miller said that was level D an acceptable level of service according to IDOT. The level of service ranges from A to F, A being the best and F being the worst.

Mr. Miller said that the study was based on different signal timings. Mr. Miller said there was a signal system that tied signals together and that with the site traffic with Lots 1-4 and some modification to the signal timings, that could be regulated by IDOT, he felt they could maintain the level of current service.

Ms. Sidhu asked whether number they were adding was similar to that UARCO had previously generated.

Mr. Miller stated that while there has been a time lag, previously there was traffic generated by UARCO, about 450 employees so that had worked at UARCO in the past.

Ms. Bush stated that the site had been vacant for a number of years, perhaps 7-8 years and traffic had been steadily increasing over the years.

Mr. Miller said they tried to quantify this over the years and determine the impact on this intersection. Mr. Miller said percentages were only one way to look at the traffic situation; and Metro also asked how the traffic system operated and how it could be improved. Metro was adding traffic in different directions, opposite the traffic flow. Mr. Miller thought the heaviest movements overall were opposite the site traffic flow.

Ms. Bush said her concern was that the increases were insubstantial, for Main and Hart Road; perhaps the impact was not as great as it was for a commercial area. However, Dundee was a residential area and residents would be less likely to accept the traffic than the other commercial sites.

Mr. Miler said that they were indeed adding 50 vehicles per hour, about one vehicle in both directions per minute. Mr. Miller said the signal cycled every 60-90 seconds so that would mean adding one vehicle per signal cycle. When compared to existing volumes, this was not that high. Metro was tying to put numbers into perspective, and to get to the number they anticipated over the peak hours.

Mr. Morrissey asked whether the vehicle counts assumed full build out of Lots 1-4.

Mr. Miller said yes.

Mr. Morrissey asked if the same were true of the percentages.

Mr. Miller said yes.

Mr. Morrissey asked about the notices the two dates in January and wanted to clarify that this was not the holiday break when school was not in session. Mr. Miller clarified that counts were taken by Civil Tech in 1999, and were completed when there was no construction going on.

.

Mr. Morrissey said he thought there was a change in signal, which was not in place in 1999.

Mr. Miller said he did not know why signal went in. and they would have to double-check that now that is was in place and those three signals at Dundee, Applebee, and Illinois Route 59.

Mr. Morrissey also questioned methodology about the traffic and understood Metro could reach back to 1999 for Civil Tech's data but now the Village of Barrington was feeling the crunch of the growth to northwest of the village and the UARCO building, with its 450 employees, had not been in picture. Mr. Morrissey referred to page 3 of the February 4 documents, which stated that Metro was not taking into account this traffic from growth to northwest. Mr. Morrissey wondered why and asked whether they had checked with Civil Tech or Regional Transportation bodies that had the data. Mr. Morrissey felt it was important for the analysis to factor in the growth to the northwest.

Mr. Miller said he felt that if these were factored in the percentages of the site impact would go down as the total traffic went up. In terms of movements, it was how many vehicles were turning from US Route 14 south onto Hart Road, and those continuing east on Lake-Cook Road to Illinois Route 59 and turning. Metro tried to isolate the impact of this development with the current conditions. Metro did not have access to everything that would be happening to northwest. There was always going to be growth.

Mr. Morrissey suggested getting the information from Civil Tech to do current comparison because there would be several years until final build out and growth from regional traffic had not been factored into the projections; and perhaps there was flaw in the analysis.

Mr. Miller explained that in the evening at Hart Road and US Route 14; the overall service was at level D in the morning and E in the afternoon.

Ms. Bush asked if there were any good intersections in town, so far we had heard only about the D's, E's and F's.

Mr. Miller observed that in the evenings, traffic southbound on Hart Road as it approached US Route 14. Mr. Miller stated if a car sat in left turn, it got a 12-second protected left turn. Then the left run arrow went off, and both northbound and southbound traffic went at the same time. While the through traffic southbound was not as heavy, any of vehicles going south restricted people going north and especially turning left, which was the heaviest movement in the evening. It was not really efficient, and more time was given to the least amount of traffic.

Metro would suggest turning it around, and signal operation and signal heads were already there. For northbound traffic, if the signal gave them a protected left arrow and through in advance when gates are down, you got a protected turn. Metro re-analyzed the intersection--what if the traffic signal gave the northbound traffic the protected left turn, and not give the southbound traffic a separate phase. What that would do is allow the northbound traffic whether they went left or straight, the traffic could go through at the end of the cycle and run north and south at the same time. What the change in the signal phasing would do is improve the intersection; not only now, but also with the new site (Lots 1-4) traffic added. That one change would bring it to a service level D from a current service level E.

Metro felt it was important because it would mean the northbound would clear out and not worry about the southbound for the majority of the cycle. It baffled Mr. Miller why it had not been incorporated before this time. This would have a significant impact. The petitioners would have to coordinate this with Illinois Department of Transportation. Mr. Miller noted that the equipment was already in place.

Mr. Morrissey asked if that was signal at US Route 14 and Hart Road.

Mr. Miller said it was. Mr. Miler observed that most of time was given to the least amount of traffic. Metro had just found out that IDOT had just authorized a couple thousand dollars to coordinate six signals along US Route 14 by adding new controllers, fiber optics, and other equipment new detectors. Hopefully this would improve the traffic. While the site would add about 5% more traffic to Hart Road and US Route 14, by implementing recommendations, the petitioner could make traffic flow better with the site traffic than before.

Mr. Morrissey asked what level of authority did Metro have to get that done with IDOT.
.
Mr. Hayward said it was result of working with all the various government bodies.

Mr. Miller said that Metro had some advantages because they had been working with Illinois Department of Transportation for the last nine years to implement changes in the area.

Mr. Morrissey asked with what success.

Mr. Miller said they had helped implement several already, and they were working with Illinois Department of Transportation on several others. Mr. Miller said that whenever a signal went in, IDOT needed to re-optimize it and to maintain the coordination. Mr. Miller said that percentages were one measure of relative impact, but how would the intersection work with the site impact after Lots 1-4 were added was also important.

Mr. Miller then addressed the gap study, which was a measurement of amount of time between two vehicles as they move along the highway. It provided the opportunities for vehicles exiting the property onto Lake-Cook Road.

Ms. Bush asked if the Gap Study was in Plan Commission materials.

Mr. Miller said it was and that they had included two different gap studies, one done on a Friday night and one on a Monday, which showed more gaps. It tried to identify how many opportunities were available for exiting vehicles. Mr. Miller had personally observed it. The biggest gaps occurred in the southbound traffic on Hart Road when the signal was green; most traffic turned left, and traffic on Lake-Cook Road had a red signal; that created some gaps.

In the evening, traffic on US Route 14 was relatively light. In the peak hours from 4-5 and 5-6, gaps of 25-30 seconds were noted, where there would not be vehicles from either direction. Mr. Miller pointed out on the graph--this was number of gaps and the number of vehicles that could exit in that gap were from 266 and 285, and the updated information was over 300.

Mr. Miller then addressed how that related to the site and whether they could accommodate all of three lots before they built the bridge to go to Lot 4. Theoretically it could. However, the petitioner indicated they would build two of the three buildings and could accommodate the traffic. There would be about 110 left turns out onto Lake-Cook Road and when compared to gap study, Mr. Miller felt they could easily accommodate two of the buildings. But when the petitioner began building 3, they would have to look at the bridge and take a look at adding another exit. That meant that after either Buildings 1 and 2 or Buildings 1 and 3, the traffic could be accommodated, but before start of 3rd building, then the petitioner would consider adding the bridge across the creek for another exit.

The alternate plan would be the same. The amount of traffic would be same because of same square footage. The internal circulation was not as good in the alternate plan because buildings were located further north, and maybe the bridge location should be more centrally located. The biggest difference was that the driveway would move further east, and that would be less desirable because traffic would be closer to intersection. Traffic generation would be about the same.

Mr. Miller then detailed Metro's recommendations, some of which were recommended in original proposal:

- Starting at North at US Route 14 and Hart Road, they needed to change signal phasing at that point. Mr. Miller said that staff indicated that there might a need to make additional improvements, such as turn lanes. However, those recommendations were made in July and included all Lots 1-4 plus Lot 5. Development of Lot 5 would include another traffic study. Lots 1-4 were 170,000 square foot. Lot 5 would be 225,000 square feet, about 20% more than total of Lots 1-4. Based on analysis of signal phasing, the traffic would still be at level service D at that intersection in the a.m. and p.m. Mr. Miller did not feel there would need to be any other changes.

- At the other end of Hart Road the exit opposite school, Metro proposed to modify light and add separate turn lanes. This drive would have two outbound lanes and one inbound. At the intersection of Hart Road& Main, Metro also recommended another turn lane. Lake County might require a more detailed intersection design study. The intersection of Hart Road & Main, even with site traffic, would operate at Service Level B to C, one of the better intersections.

- The proposed access drive on Lake-Cook Road, they would have a separate westbound turn lane with one inbound and two outbound for lefts and rights.

- One additional recommendation was for traffic westbound on Lake-Cook Road, which made a right turn on Hart Road; there was no right turn arrow even though there was a right turn lane. So theoretically each vehicle must stop before proceeding. If a right turn arrow was in place, because there was a long time for southbound Hart green, traffic westbound on Hart, there was substantial time delay. This would be called right turn overlap. It would increase capacity with that one change, with a change to controller and one or two modifications. Mr. Miller said that he was surprised that this was not already in effect with the separate right turn lane and the heavy movement. Mr. Miller felt it was a minor improvement that would improve movement both in morning and afternoon.

- At Main & Dundee, Metro was not looking at any improvements at the intersection part of it; the site's proposed traffic was counter flow; however, perhaps there might be some possible modifications to signal timing. The goal would be to maintain existing level of service in a.m. and p.m.

Mr. Hayward summarized the petitioner's presentation and addressed one of comments that was identified. One concern was that this was a dense development because of Floor Area Coverage, and Mr. Hayward showed a chart to indicate the proposed Clark Bardes when fully developed on Lots 1-4, the total coverage would be only 21%. Mr. Hayward compared it to Hamilton that was 63% covered or 200,000 square feet on 10 acres, and to the other areas that were located in South Barrington, such as Barrington Place Development, an office development. These were examples of how this development compared to those that had been approved outside of downtown Barrington.

Mr. Hayward then addressed the tax impact of proposed Lots 1-4 when fully developed and what would it provide. They estimated there would be a total tax of $453,331 with the large part $267,936 going to School District #220. Mr. Hayward further noted that not one child would be attending the schools, a favorable tax benefit.

Ms. Bush asked about the status of intergovernmental agreement.

Mr. Hayward stated that the entire development (70 acres) of Lots 1-4 in Village of Barrington and 5 residential lots in Barrington Hills when fully developed impervious coverage would be only 17%; of the site and 83% would be open space, Mr. Hayward did not think there was another project in Village of Barrington that came close to these figures with open space.

Mr. Hayward stated that the petitioners have worked with both village attorneys to draft, reviewed, and both proposed final form of agreements were pending before both boards of the two villages and they were waiting for the recommendation of this Plan Commission so that they could proceed--that would be a short synopsis of current standing.

The petitioners believe they now have provided public with complete presentation of the proposed project with the benefits to the area. He again stated that the owners of property lived, and continued to live in village, and have contributed to the community for a number of years. They were not a typical developer, they had built their homes, and they now wanted to bring their business headquarters to Barrington.

Staff Report:
Mr. Sbiral did not give the staff report due to time constraints. Mr. Sbiral briefly reviewed what was included in the staff report and the Plan Commission's materials.

A copy of the most recent agreement was attached. The process started about a year ago. The petitioner had submitted six submittals thus far. Two final notes: The Architectural Review Commission has recommended approval of the plans for the Clark Bardes Lot 1 to the Board of Trustees.

Also attached to the Staff Report was the latest agreement. The village attorney was reviewing it.

Mr. Tom Adomshick, Vice President of James J. Benes Associates addressed the Plan Commission as the traffic consultant for village. Mr. Adomshick clarified the initial recommendation for an additional northbound left turn lane on Hart Road and an eastbound right turn lane on Northwest Highway (US Route 14) at intersection of Hart and Northwest Highway was, as Mr. Miller indicated, was based on original plans that included the fifth parcel. In the updated plans, the traffic generated in the currently proposed plan was about 50% of the traffic generated in originally proposed development. In the addendum, the recommendation for improvements was consistent with southbound extensions at Lake-Cook Road and Hart Road.

Mr. Adomshick also concurred that the signal phasing at Hart and Northwest Highway would offset the impact of the additional traffic. By increasing northbound green time, the wait time for southbound traffic would increase; but that was the lesser traffic movement. This overall delay for all vehicles would drop a little even with the site traffic. The consultant also concurred with the recommendation of adding left turn lanes at each of the entrances to the site and the right turn lanes entering the site as well. With the intersection at Dundee and the increase of 8%, Benes Associates recommended it be pursued to modify signal timing and coordination to improve the traffic flow through that area.

Mr. Adomshick noted that the existing intersection only had a 50-foot right of way, so any geometric improvements that could be done were limited. A week ago, Mr. Adomshick observed the traffic at the vicinity at Hart Road; and he also did some timing of the gaps. Mr. Adomshick's findings were consistent with what Metro indicated. The gaps occurred during the green phase for southbound traffic on Hart Road. There was fairly steady westbound flow with the green light, which limited the gaps available for exiting the site. But with green for south bound, it would clear in about 10-15 seconds; and for remainder of southbound green phase, there were fairly extensive gaps for westbound traffic, and with the lower east bound would allow gaps that would allow site travel to exit during the peak hours. Because it was tied in with the phasing on Hart, the delays experienced by those exiting the site would be similar, but slightly longer than that of the southbound traffic on Hart Road.

Ms. Bush suggested that the Commission adjourn at this time and pick this up at the next meeting and then continue with the rest of the hearing.

Mr. Morrissey agreed so the Commission had time to review the staff recommendations.

Ms. Bush said she would like to read through the inter-governmental agreements.

Ms. Bush announced that at its last meeting, the Plan Commission had canceled its March 11 and March 23 meeting due to lack of quorum. April 8 was the next scheduled meeting date.

MOTION: Mr. Morrissey moved to continue this hearing to April 8, 2003. Mr. Larsen seconded. The voice vote recorded all Ayes.

Planner's Report
Mr. Sbiral said that the Listhartke petition was not ready for submittal and was continued until March 12.

Adjournment
Mr. Larsen moved to adjourn the meeting. Mr. Mack seconded the motion. The Voice Vote noted all Ayes. The Motion carried. The meeting was adjourned at 9:10 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sally Lubeno, Recording Secretary

_____

Anna Bush, Chair
Plan Commission